

REMARKS

The objections set forth in claim 5 have been corrected.

With respect to the prior art rejection, it is apparently assumed that Figures 2 and 5 are selectable electronic programming guides. This is not the case. Instead, Figures 2 and 5 constitute two separate embodiments. There is no ability to select between Figures 2 and 5. That is, there is no feature that enables the selection between the two.

It is clear that it is contemplated throughout the patent that there is only one database and one program guide. For example, column 4, line 9, refers to "a database." Column 4, line 64, talks about "the program guide." Column 5, line 4, talks about "the integrated content guide."


The material referring to Figure 5 is titled Integration of Multiple Sources. See column 7, line 15. In discussing this integration, it is explained that "the content guide of this invention provides a single point of entry to multiple sources." Thus, the reference is explicit that only a single point of entry (i.e., a single content guide) is provided.

The suggestion that the reference somehow teaches selecting between the content guides of Figures 2 and 5 is unsupportable. The material cited in column 4, lines 58-60, has nothing to do with selecting between the content guides of Figures 2 and 5.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 11, 2006



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation